



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,364	12/18/2001	Muljadi Sulistio	CMRC 1007-1	8064
22470	7590	07/26/2005	EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,364

Applicant(s)

SULISTIO ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

10

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the amendment filed 8 June 2005.
2. Claims 1-44 are pending. Claims 1 and 30 are independent claims. The rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 35 U.S.C. 103 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold et al. (XML in a Nutshell, January 2001, hereafter Harold) and further in view of Yalcinalp (US 6507857, provisional filed 12 March 1999).

As per independent claim 1, Harold discloses a method for updating a self-describing structured document, the method including:

- Receiving a character string including one or more sets of:
 - An update operator (page 15: Here, through the use of Booleans, an update operator, in this case italicization, is applied when criteria are met)
 - A path specification identifying a node at which the update operator is to be applied (pages 3-13: Here, the use of paths to identify nodes and nodes sets are disclosed)

- One or more update values (page 15: Here, the update value is italicization)
- Accessing a self-describing, structured document (page 15: Here, an XML, which the applicant admits is a self-describing structured document on page 8 of the remarks filed 8 June 2005, is accessed; Further, the XML document appears on page 2)
- Updating the document with the update values at the path specification (page 15: Here, if the document satisfies the criteria, having the profession element contents equal to "computer scientist," then the element is italicized).

Although Harold implies parsing the character string (the character string containing the update would have to be parsed in order to determine the path and the update to be applied), Harold fails to specifically disclose parsing the character string. Yalcinalp discloses parsing XML and XSLT style sheets (column 5, lines 18-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold's method with Yalcinalp's method, since it would have allowed a user to transform documents with commands (Yalcinalp: column 5, lines 18-36).

As per dependent claim 2, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the character string further includes a document ID (page 13,

paragraph 4: Here, the location path of the update identifies a set of nodes in an XML document).

As per dependent claim 3, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein accessing the document includes retrieving the document based on the document ID (page 13, paragraph 4: Here, the nodes in an XML document).

As per dependent claim 6, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the path specification is compliant with an XPath standard (page 1).

As per dependent claim 7, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 7 is similarly rejected under Harold and Yalcinalp.

As per dependent claim 15, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method further including accessing an element set list corresponding to a plurality of the update values to be applied at the path specification (page 13, paragraph 4: Here, the location path specifies a set of nodes within the document).

As per dependent claim 16, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 16 is similarly rejected under Harold and Yalcinalp.

As per dependent claim 24, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein a single update operator applies to a plurality of sets

(page 15: Here, the italics operation is applied to any set that matches the specified conditions).

As per dependent claim 25, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the update operator is implied and not explicit in the character string (page 7, section "Wildcards": Here, the template applied is "@*" which is not an explicit declaration of a template. It uses a hash to determine the value for the template).

As per dependent claim 26, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the update operator specifies adding one or more update values as sibling nodes of the node identified (page 4, section "Child Element Location Steps": Here, the operator specifies applying the update values to nodes; page 11: Here, applying operators to siblings is disclosed).

As per dependent claim 27, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses applying operators to the sibling after a node identified (page 11: Here, the following-sibling axis allows for the movement to the next sibling in a context).

As per dependent claim 28, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses applying operators to the sibling after a node identified (page 11: Here, the preceding-sibling axis allows for the movement to the previous sibling in a context).

As per dependent claim 29, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the update operator specifies adding one or more update values as descendent nodes of the node identified (page 12: Here, the descendant axis allows for movement to the next descendant for processing).

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold and Yalcinalp and further in view of "Document Object Model (DOM) Tutorial," (30 October 2000, available from www.archive.org, hereafter Document).

As per dependent claim 4, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold and Yalcinalp fail to specifically disclose the method wherein a document ID is implied by prior state information. However, Document discloses the method wherein a document ID is implied by prior state information (page 3, "Accessing the DOM Tree": Here, "reports.xml" is loaded. The loading implies that "reports.xml" is within the current working directory).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold and Yalcinalp's method with Document's method, since it would have been easier to type, less verbose, and more familiar to a user (Harold: page 10, final paragraph).

As per dependent claim 5, Harold, Yalcinalp, and Document disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Document further discloses the method wherein accessing the document includes accessing a document object model (DOM) data structure in memory (page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold, Yalcinalp, and Document's method with Document's method, since it would have allowed a user to add, change, and delete elements (Document: page 1).

As per dependent claim 8, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 7 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, and Document.

As per dependent claim 17, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 17 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, and Document.

6. Claims 9-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold and Yalcinalp and further in view of Ogbuji ("Validating XML with Schmatron," 2000).

As per dependent claim 9, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold and Yalcinalp fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the self-describing, structured document includes a document type, further including accessing a schema corresponding to the document type and validating application of the update operator and the update values at the path specification. Ogbuji discloses the method wherein the self-describing, structured document includes a document type, further including accessing a schema corresponding to the document type and validating application of the update operator

and the update values at the path specification (page 3, paragraphs 4-5: Here, Schematron is a validating application using XPath as the path specification).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold and Yalcinalp's method with Ogbuji's method, since it would have allowed a user to maintain validity of a document after a change.

As per dependent claim 10, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 10 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 12, Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses a SOX standard (page 2, paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji's method with Ogbuji's method, since it would have allowed a user to use schema languages (Ogbuji: page 2, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 13 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 18, Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses accessing a set of business processing rules (page 14: Here, the XPath basic arithmetic operators are business processing rules) corresponding to the document type

and validating application of the update operator and the update values at the path specification (page 13, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 19 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 21, Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 18, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein the business processing rules are Schematron-compliant (page 3, paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji's method with Ogbuji's method, since it would have allowed a user to validate XML (Ogbuji: page 1, paragraph 1).

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21. Claim 22 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, and Ogbuji.

7. Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold, Yalcinalp, and Document and further in view of Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 11, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 11 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, Document, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 14 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, Document, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 20, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 20 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, Document, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 23, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21. Claim 23 is similarly rejected under Harold, Yalcinalp, Document, and Ogbuji.

8. Claims 30-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold and further in view of Document.

As per independent claim 30, Harold discloses a method of applying a self-describing, structured, document, the method comprising:

- Applying a declarative transformation to a document, producing character string data including a plurality of:
 - Path specifications for nodes in the document (pages 3-13)
 - Starting values copied from the document for at least some nodes (page 15: Here, the non-italicized elements of the nodes are copied over into the result document)
 - Editable values for at least some nodes (page 15: Here, portions of the copied nodes are editable, and become italicized in the result document)

Art Unit: 2178

- Responding to a request with character string data (page 15: Here, in response to a request to modify node elements, the corresponding node elements are placed into the result document)
- Receiving an updated version of the character string (page 15: Here, the updated (italicized) version of the nodes is placed into the result document)
- Producing an updated resulting document corresponding to the updated version of the character string (page 15)

Harold fails to specifically disclose:

- Receiving a request identifying a starting document and specifying a document type to be generated from the starting document
- Accessing a transformation corresponding to the starting document and the specified document type
- Applying the transformation to the starting document producing a resulting document of the specified type

However, Document discloses:

- Receiving a request identifying a starting document and specifying a document type to be generated from the starting document (page 2, section "DOMDocument," subsection "Loading and Saving Data": Here, a user specifies a document to load, in this case the document is, "http://xmlfiles/reports.xml")

- Accessing a transformation corresponding to the starting document and the specified document type (page 2, section "DOMDocument," subsection "Loading and Saving Data": Here, a DOM file is accessed to transform the original document "http://xmlfiles/reports.xml", into the resulting document "c:\temp\reports.xml")
- Applying the transformation to the starting document producing a resulting document of the specified type ((page 2, section "DOMDocument," subsection "Loading and Saving Data")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold's method with Document's method, since it would have allowed the user to interface with the structure document (Document: page 1, "What is a DOM?" paragraph 2).

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 31 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

As per dependent claim 32, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 32 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 33 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 34 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

As per dependent claim 35, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 35 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

As per dependent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 36 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

As per dependent claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8. Claim 37 is similarly rejected under Harold and Document.

9. Claims 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold and Document and further in view of Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 38, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 38 is similarly rejected under Harold, Document, and Ogbuji.

As per dependent claim 40, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 40 is similarly rejected under Harold, Document, and Ogbuji.

10. Claims 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold, Document, and Ogbuji and further in view of "XML and EDI: Peaceful Co-Existence" (2001, hereafter EDI).

As per dependent claim 39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. EDI further discloses a chosen trading partner (page 7, Figure 4: Here, vendors and customers select trading partners).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold, Document, and Ogbuji's method with EDI's method, since it would have allowed internal application of different companies to share information directly (EDI: page 7, paragraph 1).

As per dependent claim 41, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 41 is similarly rejected under Harold, Document, Ogbuji, and EDI.

As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21. Claim 42 is similarly rejected under Harold, Document, Ogbuji, and EDI.

11. Claims 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold and Yalcinalp and further in view of Fox (US 2002/0116421, filed 17 February 2001).

As per dependent claim 43, Harold and Yalcinalp disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold and Yalcinalp fail to specifically disclose displaying a graphical user interface. However, Fox discloses displaying to a user a graphical user interface (paragraphs 0192-0212).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold and Yalcinalp's method with Fox's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily interact with data.

12. Claims 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harold, and Document, and further in view of Fox.

As per dependent claim 44, Harold and Document disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 30, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold and Document fail to specifically disclose displaying a graphical user interface. However, Fox discloses displaying to a user a graphical user interface (paragraphs 0192-0212).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Harold and Document's method with Fox's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily interact with data.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments, filed 8 June 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-37 and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Harold, Yalcinalp, Document, Fox, Ogbuji, and EDI.

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 38 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Ogbuji in view of Harold has "no notion in the references of taking into account the chosen trading partner when selecting business processing or validation rules (page 15)." The applicant puts forth this argument in conjunction with claim 39. However, claim 38 fails to disclose a "trading partner." Therefore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "trading partners") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs



**CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**